

No. 9220-4Lab-75/25225.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s. Rajindera Steel Rolling Mills, Gurgaon.

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN,
PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR
COURT, HARYANA,
ROHTAK.

Reference No. 8 of 1975

between

SHRI OM PARKASH AND THE
MANAGEMENT OF M/s. RAJINDERA
STEEL ROLLING MILLS,
GURGAON

Present :

Nemo for the workman.

Nemo for the management.

AWARD

The following dispute between the management of M/s. Rajindera Steel Rolling Mills, Gurgaon and its workman Shri Om Parkash was referred for adjudication to this court,—*vide* order No. ID/GG/114-C-74/1091—95, dated 7th November, 1975 of the Governor of Haryana, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Om Parkash was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?”

Notices of the reference having been issued to the parties, Shri Onkar Parshad, authorised representative, for the workman appeared on 6th June, 1975 and made a statement that the notice of demand served by the workman on the manage-

ment be treated as his detailed statement of claim. None having appeared for the management on 6th June, 1975, fresh notice was issued for service on the management to appear before me on 18th July, 1975.

Neither the workman nor the representative for the management is present before me to-day. The representative for the workman was directed to appear and the management has been served through registered post. It is obvious that neither party is interested in pursuing the case and the dispute between them has been resolved,—*vide* an amicable settlement.

I thus hold that there is no dispute between the parties requiring adjudication. I as such return a no dispute award. There shall, however, be no order as to costs.

Dated the 31st July, 1975.

MOHAN LAL JAIN.

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 1794, dated the 5th August, 1975.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

MOHAN LAL JAIN.

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 9197-4Lab-75/25227.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s. Two—A—Asbestos (P.) Ltd., Bahadurgarh.

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN,
PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR
COURT, HARYANA,
ROHTAK

Reference No. 66 of 1974

between

SHRI MEWA RAM AND THE MANAGE-
MENT OF M/s TWO A ASBESTOS
(P.) LTD., BAHADURGARH

Present :

Shri Rajinder Singh for the work-
man.

Nemo for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/RK/287-D-74/31119—
23, dated 11th September, 1974 of the
Governor of Haryana, the following dis-
pute between the management of
Two—A—Asbestos (P.) Ltd., Bahadurgarh
and its workman Shri Mewa Ram, was
referred for adjudication to this court, in
exercise of the powers conferred by
clause (c) of sub-section (i) of Section 10
of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

“Whether the termination of ser-
vices of Shri Mewa Ram was
justified and in order ? If not,
to what relief is he entitled ?”

Notices of the reference having been
sent to the parties. Shri Rajinder Singh,
representative for the workman, appeared
on 20th December, 1974 and filed the
statement of claim on behalf of the work-
man. None having appeared for the
management on this date, despite service
of the notice, *ex-parte* proceedings were
taken against them.

The workman was directed to adduce
his *ex-parte* evidence in support of the
statement of claim filed by him on 11th
February, 1975. Shri Rajinder Singh,
appearing for the workman on this date
prayed for an adjournment to adduce his
ex-parte evidence with the result that the
case was adjourned to 3rd April, 1975 on
his request.

Neither the workman nor any of his
witnesses was present even on 3rd April,
1975, and on a request made by his repre-
sentative for adjournment to produce *ex*
parte evidence, the case was again ad-
journed to 7th May, 1975.

Shri O. P. Sharma, my learned predi-
cessor having cancelled his tour to
Bahadurgarh on 7th May, 1975 for some
reasons, the case was fixed for to-day with
an intimation to that effect to the work-
man.

Shri Rajinder Singh, representative,
for the workman is present before me to-
day. He has made a statement that the
workman could not be available despite
best efforts made by him in this connection
and that he under the circumstances has
to unavoidably withdraw the demand
made by the workman on the manage-
ment and subsequently referred to this
court for adjudication by the Governor of
Haryana.

It would appear that neither the
management nor the workman is interest-
ed in pursuing their case, so much so, a
statement has been made on behalf of the
workman in respect of the withdrawal of
the demand.

I as such hold that there is now no
dispute between the parties requiring ad-
judication. I in consequences return a no
dispute award with no order as to costs.
Dated the 6th August, 1975.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 1820, dated the 6th August, 1975.

Forwarded (four copies) to the
Secretary to Government of Haryana,
Labour & Employment Departments,
Chandigarh, as required under section 15
of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.